

East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 (EMG2)

Document [6.2]

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Volume 1 Main Statement

Chapter 1

Introduction and Scope

[January] 2025

01

The East Midlands Gateway Phase 2
and Highway Order 202X and The East Midlands Gateway
Rail Freight and Highway (Amendment) Order 202X

[SEGRO.COM/SLPEMG2](https://www.segro.com/slpemg2)

SEGRO

1. Introduction and Scope

1.1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. This Environmental Statement (ES) has been prepared to accompany applications made by SEGRO Properties Ltd and SEGRO (EMG) Ltd, (referred to in the ES as 'SEGRO' or the 'Applicant'), relating to a second phase of its East Midlands Gateway Logistics Park (EMG1). This proposed second phase to EMG1 is known as East Midlands Gateway 2 (referred to as EMG2).
- 1.1.2. EMG1 is a nationally significant infrastructure development comprising a rail freight terminal and warehousing. It was authorised by The East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange and Highway Order 2016 (SI 2016/17) (the EMG1 DCO) and is substantially complete.
- 1.1.3. The proposed second phase to EMG1 is known as East Midlands Gateway 2 (referred to as EMG2) and in brief comprises the following:
- **EMG2 Main Site** – a new multi-unit logistics/industrial development located south of East Midlands Airport and the A453, and west of the M1 motorway. This part of the site falls within the 'East Midlands Airport and Gateway Industrial Cluster' (EMAGIC) site, which forms part of the East Midlands Freeport designated by the Government in 2022;
 - **Highways Works** – works to the highway network including significant improvements at Junction 24 of the M1 (referred to as J24 Improvements) and the road network interacting with that junction, and
 - **EMG1 Works** – the proposals include changes within EMG1, incorporating additional warehousing on Plot 16 together with works to increase the permitted height of the cranes at the rail-freight terminal, improvements to the public transport interchange and site management building.
- 1.1.4. The three components of EMG2 above are collectively referred to in this ES as the **Scheme**. Section 1.4 of this Chapter, together with Chapter 3 of this ES, provide more detail about each of these elements.

1.2. Consenting Process

- 1.2.1. The Applicant has made two concurrent applications for the three component parts of the **Scheme** comprising: (1) an application for a Development Consent Order (referred to as the DCO Application) for the **EMG2 Main Site** component and the **Highways Works**, and (2) an application for a material change to the existing EMG1 DCO (referred to as the Material Change Order Application, or MCO) for the **EMG1 Works**. This approach to consenting and the assessment of all component parts of the Scheme in this ES is explained further as follows:

The DCO Application

1.2.2. The DCO Application is made pursuant to section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008), in accordance with the direction made by the Secretary of State under section 35 of the PA 2008 and dated 21 February 2024 (the Direction). In response to a request from the Applicant, the Secretary of State adopted a Scoping Opinion in respect of the **Scheme** on 24 September 2024 (the Scoping Opinion) pursuant to Regulation 10 of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations). This ES is provided in support of the DCO Application and in accordance with Regulation 5(2)(a) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (2009 Regulations). The DCO Application is formed of two component parts:

- **EMG2 Main Site** – The Direction confirmed that the Applicant's proposals for the **EMG2 Main Site** satisfied the criteria for business and commercial projects and should be treated as a development of national significance for which development consent is required; and
- **Highways Works** – These works include substantial improvements to the strategic highways network around Junction 24 of the M1 (the J24 Improvements). These works qualify as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) in their own right.

The MCO Application

1.2.3. The MCO Application for the third component comprising the **EMG1 Works**, is made pursuant to section 153 and schedule 6 of the PA 2008 for an amendment to the East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange and Highways Order 2016 (SI 2016/17) (EMG1 DCO). The EMG1 DCO was supported by an environmental impact assessment (EIA) which was completed pursuant to The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 in force at the time, however those regulations have since been revoked and replaced by the EIA Regulations. **Table 1.6 at Annex A** records the changes introduced by the EIA Regulations.

1.2.4. The MCO Application for the **EMG1 Works** is a subsequent application for EIA development for the purposes of the EIA Regulations. The **EMG1 Works** form part of the proposed works considered in the Scoping Opinion to ensure the environmental impacts arising from the MCO Application are appropriately considered and assessed against the current EIA Regulations. This ES is prepared in support of the MCO Application and provided pursuant to Regulation 16(j) of the Infrastructure Planning (Changes to, and Revocation of, Development Consent Orders) Regulations 2011 (2011 Regulations).

Approach to ES

1.2.5. Notwithstanding the differentiation in terms of applications under the required consenting regimes, given the integrated nature of the **Scheme**, all component parts have been subject to a single EIA undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations. The findings of the assessment are reported in this ES which has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 14 as informed by Schedule 4 and Regulation 22 of the EIA Regulations and responds to the Scoping Opinion adopted by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on behalf of the Secretary of State on 24 September 2024. Notwithstanding the single ES approach, each chapter makes a clear distinction between the component parts, assessing them separately

and then in combination (cumulatively) wherever possible, and where this is not the case the reasoning is explained in the methodology for the relevant chapter.

1.3. ES Content

- 1.3.1. Regulation 14(2) of the EIA Regulations sets out the minimum requirements for an ES with further detail at Schedule 4. **Table 1.1** sets out where the requirements of Schedule 4 are met within this ES.

Table 1.1: Schedule 4 Requirements Summary

Schedule 4 ref:	Requirement	Chapter of ES
1a	A description of the location of the development.	ES Chapter 2
1b	A description of the main physical characteristics of the whole development and the land use requirements during construction and operational phases.	ES Chapter 3
1c	A description of the main characteristics of the operational phase of the development such as energy demand, nature and quantity of materials and natural resources used.	ES Chapters 3, 18 and 19
1d	An estimate, by type and quantity, of the expected residues, emissions and waste produced during the construction and operational phases.	ES Chapters 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 18 and 19
2	A description of the reasonable and relevant alternatives considered.	ES Chapter 4
3	A description of the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment (baseline scenario).	ES Chapters 5-20
4	A description of the factors specified in Regulation 5(2) likely to be significantly affected by the development (population, human health, biodiversity, land and soils, water, air, climate, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape).	ES Chapters 5-21
5	A description of the likely significant effects on the environment deriving from both the construction and operation stages of the development including from direct, indirect and cumulative impacts.	ES Chapters 5-21
6	A description of the forecasting methods or evidence used to identify the significant effects.	ES Chapters 5-21
7	A description of the measures envisaged to avoid, prevent, reduce or offset any identified significant adverse effects (mitigation).	ES Chapters 5-21
8	A description of the expected significant adverse effects deriving from the vulnerability of the development to risks of major accidents and/or disasters as relevant.	ES Chapter 21
9	A non-technical summary of the above.	Separate NTS provided as Document [x]

Schedule 4 ref:	Requirement	Chapter of ES
10	A reference list detailing the sources used for the assessments.	ES Chapters 5-21

1.4. The proposed development

1.4.1. The location of the **Scheme** and its component parts is identified on [Documents 2.1 and MCO 2.1] and included as [Figures 2.1 and 2.2] to this ES. It is also described in further detail within **Chapter 2** of this ES, again with reference to its various component parts. In brief, the majority of new build development will be on the **EMG2 Main Site**. The remaining components of the proposals are located on land required for off-site highway improvements, and on land within EMG1.

1.4.2. The development proposals are described in detail within **Chapter 3** of this ES, again with reference to its component parts. In brief, the three elements are as follows:

The DCO Application

- **EMG2 Main Site** – a maximum of 300,000sq.m. (approximately 3.23 million sq. ft.) (GIA) of warehousing and manufacturing floorspace (GIA), with an additional 100,000sq.m. in the form of internal mezzanine space; and
- **Highway Works** – new highway infrastructure and works to the existing highways network – principally in relation to J24 Improvements. This will include a new free-flow link road from the M1 northbound at J24 to the A50 westbound, widening of the A50 eastbound link at J24 and other related works and traffic management measures.

The MCO Application

- **EMG1 Works** – a maximum of 26,500 sq.m (approximately 285,000 sq.ft) (GIA) of additional warehousing on land known as Plot 16, with an additional 3,500 sq.m allowance in the form of internal mezzanine space. In addition, it is proposed to undertake freight handling and efficiency improvements at the existing rail freight terminal by way of increases to the maximum permitted height of gantry cranes by 4m to 24m overall; together with works to expand the management suite building and public transport interchange enhancements.

1.5. Description of reasonable alternatives

1.5.1. To satisfy the requirements of Regulation 14(2)(d) and Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations, **Chapter 4** of this ES includes a description of the reasonable alternatives which have been considered by the applicant and provides an explanation why the **Scheme** and its component parts has been chosen over the considered alternatives taking the effects of the development on the environment into account.

1.6. Factors likely to be significantly affected by the development

1.6.1. In accordance with Regulation 10 of the EIA Regulations, an EIA Scoping Request was submitted on 14 August 2024 to seek the Secretary of State's opinion as to the scope, and level of detail, of the information to be provided in this ES. A copy of the Scoping Report is enclosed as **Appendix 1a** to this ES.

1.6.2. PINS adopted the Scoping Opinion on behalf of the Secretary of State on 24 September 2024 which advised that the areas of potential significance requiring consideration in this ES are:

- Landscape and Visual (including the effects of lighting);
- Ecology and Biodiversity;
- Traffic and Transport;
- Air Quality;
- Noise and Vibration;
- Flood Risk and Drainage;
- Cultural Heritage;
- Agriculture and Soils;
- Climate Change;
- Socio-economic;
- Materials and Waste;
- Population and Human Health;
- Ground Conditions;
- Material Assets (utilities);
- Minerals Safeguarding; and
- Vulnerability to Major Accidents and Disasters.

1.6.3. A copy of the Scoping Opinion [Document 6.1] is included as **Appendix 1b** to this ES.

1.6.4. The only matter identified by PINS which has subsequently been scoped out of this assessment is minerals safeguarding. This is a result of additional consultation carried out with the minerals planning authority (Leicestershire County Council) which has resulted in agreement with the authority that all necessary information is now available to be able to conclude that the matter can be fully scoped out. The relevant correspondence and documentation is provided as **[Appendix xx]**.

1.6.5. The remaining environmental factors have been the subject of an EIA and the findings are reported in Chapters 5-21 of this ES.

1.6.6. Each chapter sets out the scope and methodology employed to carry out the assessment and the policy and legislative context within which the assessment has been prepared. It then considers the baseline conditions for each of the environmental factors before identifying the

nature, scale and significance of the likely impacts, in terms of positive, neutral and negative (or adverse) effects. In relation to negative/adverse effects, the assessment establishes the significance of such impacts and determines what, if any, mitigation measures can be introduced to avoid, prevent, reduce, or offset those effects. Taking any identified mitigation measures into account, each ES chapter identifies any residual impacts and determines their significance. These topic-based assessments satisfy the requirements of Regulation 14(2)(b) and 14(2)(c) and Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations.

1.7. Project Team, Experience and Competence

- 1.7.1. Regulation 14(4)(a) of the EIA Regulations requires that ES are prepared by competent experts and Regulation 14(4)(b) mandates an accompanying statement outlining relevant expertise and qualifications. SEGRO has appointed a team of specialists to undertake the assessment and produce this ES and the supporting technical information. This team comprises of experts in their professional fields and is summarised in **Table 1.2:**

Table 1.2: SEGRO's Technical Team

Consultant	Discipline and Chapters	Lead Assessor/Author, position and qualifications
Delta Planning	Town Planning/EIA co-ordinators. Lead authors of Chapters 1-4, 21 and 22. NTS.	David Green, Director, BSc (Hons) MRICS MRTPI
Oxalis Planning	DCO Planning. DCO and EIA expertise and support.	Ben Holmes, Managing Director, MA BA (Hons) MRTPI
UMC Architects	Masterplanning. Preparation of parameters and illustrative layout plans.	Matthew Salanyk, Director, RIBA
BWB	Infrastructure and civils design. Preparation of infrastructure plans and works plans.	Simon Hilditch, Director, MEng (Hons), CEng MICE MCIHT
BWB	Traffic and Transport. Author of Chapter 6 and associated appendices.	Paul Wilson, Director, MCIHT MSoRSA CMILT MInstLM
BWB	Flood risk and drainage. Author of Chapter 13 and associated appendices.	Robin Green, Associate Director, BSc (Hons)
BWB	Materials and Waste. Author of Chapter 18 and associated appendices.	Matthew Wilby, Director, MSc (Hons), BSc (Hons), CEnv, MIEMA
iTP	Sustainable travel. Author of Sustainable Travel Strategy and Framework Travel Plan (Appendices [6[x] and 6[x]])	Stephanie Meyers, Associate Director, BSc (Hons)

Consultant	Discipline and Chapters	Lead Assessor/Author, position and qualifications
Vanguardia/ Buro Happold	Noise and vibration. Author of Chapter 7.	Chris Goff, Associate, MSc, MIOA
Vanguardia/ Buro Happold	Air Quality. Author of Chapter 8 and associated appendices.	Simon Grubb, Associate, BSc (Hons), MA, MIEEnvSc, MIAQM
FPCR	Ecology and Biodiversity. Author of Chapter 9 and associated appendices.	Sam Arthur, Senior Director, BSc (Hons), MSc
FPCR	Landscape and Visual Impacts. Author of Chapter 10 and associated appendices.	Tim Jackson, Senior Director, BA (Hons), DipLA
DFL	Lighting. Author of Chapter 11 and associated appendices.	Daniel Spreadborough, Senior Lighting Engineer, BA (Hons), MSc
RPS	Cultural heritage. Author of Chapter 12 and associated appendices.	Chris Clarke, Senior Associate Director, BSc (Hons) MA MCIfA
RPS	Climate Change. Author of Chapter 19 and associated appendices.	Andrew Tasker, Associate Director MSc, BSc (Hons)
Fairhurst	Site investigation and ground engineering. Author of Chapter 14 and associated appendices.	Dicken Maclean, Principal Geoenvironmental Engineer, BSc, MSc, RSoBRA, CEnv.
LRA	Agricultural soils. Author of Chapter 15 and associated appendices.	Mike Palmer, Director PhD
Utility Connections	Utilities. Author of Chapter 16 and associated appendices.	Daniel Borg, Managing Director, [xx]
Savills	Socio-economics. Author of Chapter 5 and associated appendices.	Mark Powney, Head of Economics,[xx]
Savills	Population and human health. Author of Chapter 17 and associated appendices.	Dr Andrew Buroni, Director of Health and Social Impact, [xx]
Savills	Major Accidents and Disasters. Author of Chapter 20 and associated appendices.	Tom McClure, Associate Director, MIEMA

1.8. Methodology and Format of the Assessment

- 1.8.1. This ES has been structured on a topic basis with each of the assessment chapters presented in a common format. To ensure this approach avoids any overlooking of inter-related effects and intra-project cumulative impacts, the ES has been co-ordinated and reviewed by Delta Planning and the specialist team has been closely involved in the interpretation and review of each of the other technical assessments both through joint design team meetings, specific subject workshops and through cross working and review of draft chapters where appropriate. Where such inter-related effects are identified, the matters and receptors affected are identified in the individual chapters and the effects assessed.
- 1.8.2. As explained in Section 1.2, insofar as the **Scheme** incorporates both a DCO Application and a MCO Application the ES will make a clear distinction between the component parts, assessing them separately and then in combination (cumulatively) wherever possible, and where this is not the case the reasoning will be explained in the relevant Chapter.
- 1.8.3. The EIA has, where possible, been carried out based on a consistent set of impact assessment magnitudes (as defined in **Tables 1.3-1.5**) and with a consistent approach regarding the duration of impacts (as defined in **Table 1.6**). Some specific disciplines have their own industry standard approaches and where this is the case it is explained within the individual chapters of this ES.
- 1.8.4. It is nevertheless broadly accepted that the significance of an effect is determined by the relationship between two factors:
- The sensitivity, importance or value of the affected resource or receptor; and
 - The actual change taking place to the environment (i.e. the magnitude or severity of an effect).
- 1.8.5. The sensitivity, importance or value of the resource or receptor is generally based on its relative importance using the scale set out at **Table 1.3**.

Table 1.3: Methodology for Determining Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Example of Receptor
High	The receptor/resource has little ability to absorb change without fundamentally altering its present character, or is of international or national importance.
Moderate	The receptor/resource has moderate capacity to absorb change without significantly altering its present character, or is of high importance.
Low	The receptor/resource is tolerant of change without detriment to its character, or is of low or local importance

- 1.8.6. The magnitude of an effect is generally described using the terminology set out in **Table 1.4**.

Table 1.4: Methodology for Assessing Magnitude

Magnitude of Impact	Criteria for Assessing Impact
High	Total loss of or major/substantial alteration to key elements of the baseline (pre-development) conditions such that the post development character/composition/attributes will be fundamentally changed.
Moderate	Loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features of the baseline condition such that post development character/composition/attributes of the baseline will be materially changed.
Low	A minor shift away from baseline conditions. Change arising from the loss/alteration will be discernible/detectable but not material. The underlying character/composition/attributes of the baseline condition will be similar to the pre-development circumstance/situation.
Negligible	Very little change from baseline conditions. Change barely distinguishable, approximating to a 'no change' situation.

- 1.8.7. The significance of an effect is generally determined using the matrix in **Table 1.5**. The matrix looks at the interaction between receptor sensitivity and impact magnitude. Individual chapters will explain how this approach will be applied to the specific topic concerned and how the distinction between effects has been applied.

Table 1.5: Effect Significance Matrix

Magnitude	Sensitivity		
	High	Moderate	Low
High	Major Adverse/Beneficial*	Major-Moderate Adverse/Beneficial*	Moderate-Minor Adverse/Beneficial
Moderate	Moderate Adverse/Beneficial*	Moderate-Minor Adverse/Beneficial	Minor Adverse/Beneficial
Low	Moderate-Minor Adverse/Beneficial	Minor Adverse/Beneficial	Minor-Negligible
Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

* These effects are considered significant for the purposes of the EIA Regulations.

- 1.8.8. The duration of effects is generally defined as in **Table 1.6**.

Table 1.6: Duration of Impacts

Duration	Definition
Short term	The effects would be of short duration and would not last more than 2-5 years
Medium term	The effects would take 5-15 years to be mitigated
Long term	The effects would be reasonably mitigated over a long period of time (15 years or more)

1.9. Structure of the Environmental Statement

1.9.1. This ES is structured as follows:

- Chapter 2: Site and Surroundings;
- Chapter 3: Project Description;
- Chapter 4: Consideration of Alternatives;
- Chapter 5: Socio-Economic;
- Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport;
- Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration;
- Chapter 8: Air Quality;
- Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity;
- Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual;
- Chapter 11: Lighting;
- Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage;
- Chapter 13: Flood Risk and Drainage;
- Chapter 14: Ground Conditions;
- Chapter 15: Agriculture and Soils;
- Chapter 16: Utilities;
- Chapter 17: Population and Human Health;
- Chapter 18: Materials and Waste;
- Chapter 19: Climate Change;
- Chapter 20: Major Accidents and Disasters;
- Chapter 21: Cumulative Impacts; and
- Chapter 22: Summary and Conclusions.

1.9.2. The technical appendices for this ES are included in a separate volume identified as the Environment Assessment Technical Appendices and a separate Non-technical Summary is also provided.

Table 1.7: Changes introduced by the EIA Regulations

Revoked 2009 EIA regulation No.	EIA Regulation No.	Description of change
n/a	New Regulation 2 - Review	The Secretary of State must carry out a review of these regulations. The first review was published on 21 May 2022. Subsequent reviews must be published at intervals not exceeding 5 years.
Regulation 3 – Prohibition on granting consent without consideration of environmental information.	Regulation 4 – Prohibition on granting consent without consideration of environmental information.	<p>The original wording in the revoked 2009 EIA regulations mandated the decision maker to take the environmental information into consideration and state in its decision that it has done so.</p> <p>Updated wording in the EIA Regulations prevents the Secretary of State from making an order granting development or subsequent consent unless an EIA has been carried out in respect of that application.</p>
n/a	New Regulation 5 – Environmental impact assessment process	<p>5(2) – The EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate matter, the direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed development on the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Population and human health; b) Biodiversity; c) Land soil, water, air and climate; d) Material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape; e) The interaction between the factors referred to in sub-paras (a) to (d) <p>5(3) The EIA must include the operational effects of the proposed development on those factors</p> <p>5(4) The significant effects to be assessed include, where relevant, the vulnerability of the proposed development to major accidents or disasters</p>

<p>Regulation 6 – Procedure for establishing whether environmental impact assessment is required</p>	<p>Regulation 8 – Procedure for establishing whether environmental impact assessment is required.</p>	<p>The updated wording requires additional information to be provided when asking the Secretary of State to adopt a screening opinion or subsequent screening opinion.</p> <p>8(3) a person must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A plan identifying the land; b. A description of the development including (i) the physical characteristics of the whole development, and (ii) a description of the location of the development with particular regard to the environmental sensitivity fo geographical areas likely to be affected; c. A description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected; and d. To the extent available, a description of any likely significant effects of the development on the environment resulting from (i) the expected residues and emissions and the production of waste, and (ii) the use of natural resources, in particular soil, land, water and biodiversity.
<p>Regulation 7 – Considerations for screening decisions</p>	<p>Regulation 9 – Considerations for screening decisions</p>	<p>Updated wording requires additional matters to be taken into account when deciding whether further information is required in order to determine a subsequent application including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Any information provided in accordance with Regulation 8; b) The results of any relevant EU environmental assessment; c) Such of the selection criteria set out in Schedule 3 as are relevant to the development; d) Whether information that was available to the decision-maker when granting development consent has changed; e) Whether new information on the likely environmental effects of the development has become available since granting development consent;

		<p>f) Whether new information referred to in (d) and (e) is material to the decision as to whether the proposed development is likely to have significant effects on the environment or the particular nature or extent of those effects.</p>
10 – Consultation statement requirements	Regulation 12 – Consultation statement requirements	<p>A new definition of "preliminary environmental information" was inserted, meaning information which:</p> <p>a) has been compiled by the applicant; and</p> <p>b) is reasonably required for the consultation bodies to develop an informed view of the likely significant environmental effects of the development.</p>
n/a	New Regulation 14 – Environmental Statements	<p>14(2) mandates that an Environmental Statement must as a minimum include:</p> <p>a) A description of the proposed development comprising information on the site, design, size and other relevant features of the development;</p> <p>b) A description of the likely significant effects of the proposed development on the environment;</p> <p>c) A description of features or measures to avoid, prevent or reduce and, if possible, offset likely significant effects on the environment;</p> <p>d) A description of the reasonable alternatives studied and main reasons for the option chosen;</p> <p>e) A non-technical summary of the information in (a) to (d); and</p> <p>f) Any additional information specified in Schedule 4 (see Table 1.1 above);</p> <p>14(3) the ES must be based on the Scoping Opinion;</p> <p>14(4) the ES must be prepared by competent experts.</p>

n/a	New Regulation 21 – Consideration of whether development consent should be granted	<p>21(1) When deciding whether to grant development consent the Secretary of State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Examine the environmental information; b) Reach a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment; c) Integrate that conclusion into the decision; and d) If an order is to be made, consider whether it is appropriate to impose monitoring measures. <p>21(3) when considering monitoring the Secretary of State must also consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Potential remedial action; b) Take steps to ensure the parameters and duration of monitoring is proportionate; c) Avoid duplication of monitoring where existing monitoring arrangements are carried out in accordance with a separate obligation or law.
Regulation 18 – Subsequent application for EIA Development	Regulation 22 – Subsequent application for EIA Development	The changes introduced by the EIA Regulations permit an Applicant to display its updated ES free of charge on its website and extends the deadline for responses to the notice period from 28 to 30 days.
n/a	New Regulation 25 – Decision making on subsequent applications	<p>25(1) When deciding whether to grant subsequent consent the Secretary of State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Examine the environmental information; b) Reach a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment; c) Integrate that conclusion into the decision; and d) If subsequent consent is to be granted, consider whether it is appropriate to impose monitoring measures.

		<p>25(3) when considering monitoring the Secretary of State must also consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Potential remedial action; b) Take steps to ensure the parameters and duration of monitoring is proportionate; c) Avoid duplication of monitoring where existing monitoring arrangements are carried out in accordance with a separate obligation or law.
n/a	New Regulation 26 – Co-ordination	The Secretary of State must, where appropriate, ensure that the Habitats Regulation Assessment and EIA are co-ordinated
n/a	New Regulation 27 – Availability of copies of environmental statements	The Secretary of State must ensure that the ES is available on the website maintained by or on behalf of the Secretary of State
n/a	New Regulation 30 – Decision notices	This regulation confirms the Secretary of State must provide reasons for the decision and notify the application of their right to challenge the validity of the decision
n/a	New Regulation 33 – Exemptions	Permits the Secretary of State to direct that a proposed development is exempt from the requirements of the EIA Regulations
n/a	New Regulation 35 – Objectivity and bias	Confirms that the Secretary of State and Examining Authority must perform their duties in an objective manner and avoid conflicts of interest